

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY
Washington, D. C.

MINUTES OF A REGULAR MEETING
OF THE FACULTY SENATE HELD ON
NOVEMBER 13, 1987, IN LISNER HALL
ROOM 603

The meeting was called to order by President Elliott at 2:12 p.m.

Present: President Elliott, Registrar Gaglione, Parliamentarian Schechter, Berkovich, Birnbaum, Burks, Clark, Cohn, Deering, East, Elgart, Fox, Garris, Grub, Kirsch, Levy, Liebowitz, Loeser, Morgan, Pierpont, Reeves, Robinson, Schiff, Simons, Shotel, A. Smith, G. Smith, Solomon, Tolchin, Vontress, and Zubrow

Absent: Vice President French, Barron, Cibinic, Lovett, Paratore, Robbins, and Yezer

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

The minutes of the regular meeting of October 9, 1987, were approved as distributed.

RESOLUTIONS

On behalf of the Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom Committee, Professor Morgan, Chairman, moved the adoption of Resolution 87/3, "A Resolution Relating to Sabbatical Leave Policy," and the motion was seconded. Professor Morgan explained that the Committee on Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom and the Committee on Appointment, Salaries and Promotion Policies had been asked by the Executive Committee to review a proposal from the Vice President for Academic Affairs' Office for new language to be included in the Faculty Handbook regarding the sabbatical leave policy. The PEAF Committee addressed in detail the issue of remuneration of faculty while on sabbatical leave. The Committee unanimously concluded that the question of remuneration, in addition to the University salary, was simply irrelevant unless the requirement of attaining such additional compensation would interfere with the purposes of the sabbatical leave. He said that the Committee was of the view that the language in the Faculty Code pertaining to sabbatical leave was adequate and that it was inadvisable to include in the Faculty Handbook the type of detailed information that was proposed. A discussion followed by Professors Kirsch, Morgan and Levy. The question was called, and Resolution 87/3 was adopted unanimously. (Resolution 87/3 is attached.)

INTRODUCTION OF RESOLUTIONS

There were no resolutions introduced.

REPORT BY ROBERT D. SHOUP, DIRECTOR OF THE BUDGET

Director of the Budget Robert D. Shoup reported on the Enrollment Figures for Fall 1987 and Budgetary Planning for 1988-89. He pointed out that the main difference in the material distributed this year with the agenda was that it did not include an actual budget because the budget cycle had been changed to coordinate with the implementation of the new planning process. The proposed new budget for FY 1988-89 would be submitted to the Board of Trustees in March 1988. With regard to the enrollment data, Mr. Shoup noted that pre-SIA students, who normally would have been reported as part of Columbian College, had been reclassified as a part of the School of International Affairs. This would be consistent with what would be happening over the course of the year as freshmen and sophomore students elect whether to continue in Columbian College or to be classified in SIA. With reference to the 1988-89 Operating Budget, Proposed Expense and Revenue Changes, Mr. Shoup said that this was being proposed using the current year as a base budget, and at the time it was prepared, it was intended to be adjusted downward in the expense budget by 2% across-the-board. Inasmuch as that was revised last week, the changes would be adjusted, not through an across-the-board 2%, but through selected reductions in expense budgets that might be identified through meetings with the Provost, Vice President for Academic Affairs, Deans, and the other Vice Presidents. The other source for adjusting the current year budget, he said, would be the use of unrestricted gifts and bequests that were normally transferred directly to quasi-endowment funds. After briefly summarizing items listed in the proposed expense and revenue changes, GWU tuition rates for 1988-89, and comparative tuition rates of other schools, Mr. Shoup said that he would be glad to answer questions.

Professor Clark asked whether the \$900,000 increase in the retirement fund would be going primarily into the funding of the retirement program for lower salary employees because of the mandate of federal law. Mr. Shoup called upon Provost Johnson to respond to that question.

Provost Johnson explained that a Special Committee on Retirement had been established some years ago to revise the University's retirement plan. One of the main concerns of the Committee was that a large number of lower paid staff and faculty were not participating in the retirement plan, despite the fact that the University had reduced the contribution levels by the employees to as low as 1% in the hopes of making the plan more attractive. With the passage of the Tax Reform Act of 1986, the Provost said, stringent rules and regulations were mandated

pertaining to retirement plans which had to do with the level of participation in the plan and the requirements for continuation as a qualified plan. He said that there were over 2,000 employees, both faculty and staff, who participated in GW's retirement plan, but that most of them were at the upper income level. There were some 2,400 employees who were eligible to participate in the plan, but who did not. By definition of the Tax Reform Act, then, Provost Johnson said that there was not sufficient coverage across the University and GW's retirement plan would appear as though its coverage was geared to the upper level employee. In order to conform with the law, the University had worked very closely with TIAA/CREF, and the basic change in the retirement plan, effective January 1, 1989, was that it would no longer be a contributory plan. The University would simply contribute an amount equal to 10% of the individual's salary to TIAA/CREF for all eligible employees who were regular full-time and part-time. Those employees who were now contributing 5% or more in the plan could elect to continue or discontinue their contributions. The law would permit a waiting period and age requirement for participation. Because of the tremendous amount of turnover in staff during the first two years of employment, Provost Johnson said that the University adopted a plan with the requirement that an employee must be 21 years of age and must have had two years' of service before participation in the retirement plan.

Professor Morgan asked whether a new employee who wished to participate prior to the two-year waiting period would be able to do so by contributing his or her 5% to be matched by the University. The Provost responded that it was his understanding that the University would be precluded from doing that because the two-year waiting period had to apply to everybody. Dr. Elliott noted that that was correct unless the individual brought a participatory TIAA/CREF policy with him or her. Professor Schiff said he understood that it might be possible for the University to make contributions to the plan retroactively once the employee had been here for two years. Provost Johnson said that it also might be possible for employees age 30 or over to have just a six months' waiting period, and that these were the kinds of possibilities that were being looked into.

Professor Kirsch said that while it might be true that the major part of the \$900,000 for retirement would go to non-faculty, he pointed out that there was a large number of assistant professors and a fair number of associate professors who also were not participating and who would benefit from the new plan. He applauded the continued upgrading of the medical benefits and secretarial salary adjustments. With regard to the 6% salary increases, however, Professor Kirsch illustrated what that would actually mean to a faculty member earning \$40,000. After deducting taxes and health insurance premiums, the 6% raise, or \$2,400, would amount to the magnificent sum of approximately \$700 to meet all additional cost-of-living increases. He said that

the 6% increase just held the faculty "even" and he urged the administration to move as expeditiously as possible to bring faculty salaries up to AAUP averages. [At this point, President Elliott turned the chair over to Professor Robinson, as he had to leave.] Further discussion followed by Professors Deering, Grub, Schiff, Mr. Shoup, and Dean Liebowitz.

The discussion then centered around the recall of the previously announced 2% cut across-the-board and the adjustments that would be made. Professor Clark asked whether the University had considered the possibility of refinancing the Academic Center revenue bonds to reduce the principal payments, and Mr. Shoup answered that Vice President Diehl was aware of that possibility; however, Mr. Shoup thought that with the diversion of funds from the unrestricted gifts and bequests, an adjustment could be made to balance the budget for the current year and probably hold into the next year. Professor Deering said that if the sources of the shortfall, such as budget overruns in several schools and problems in 2000 Pennsylvania Avenue, were one-cycle events, he did not understand why the 2% cut would carry forward into future budgets unless the administration was planning for continued shortfalls. Mr Shoup replied that the sources of the 2% deficit were not one-cycle events to the extent that adjustments would have to be made in the base budget. Further discussion followed by Professors Deering, Grub, Schechter, Garris, and Mr. Shoup.

Professor Garris asked Mr. Shoup if he was planning on providing the Senate with the new complete budget that will become available in March 1988 since the budget information that was normally available at this time had been delayed because of the planning process. Mr. Shoup responded that he would be available to report to the Senate at that time. Professor Fox recommended that Vice President Diehl be invited to address the Senate on budgetary aspects with regard to real estate investments before the next budgetary explanation was made. Specifically, Professor Fox said that he would like to know what real estate investments have been made in the past two years, who made the decisions and when, and what kind of academic input was included, if any. Professor Tolchin noted that one of the reasons for the formation of the Commission for the Year 2000 was to plan for future creative and innovative programs because the University would be coming into some \$9-11 million dollars a year over the next three years and that some debts would be paid off. She said that the Administration had felt very positive about creating new programs, and she wondered if that expectation was too optimistic now. Provost Johnson replied that he did not remember those "big" numbers, but, at that time, a big portion of it was based on the assumption that the National Academy of Sciences would renew its lease, which it did not. Professor Grub said that he was encouraged to hear that the administration would use some of its uncommitted funds to offset the budget; however, he would suggest that a portion of those funds be used to adjust

faculty salaries that were already below the 80th percentile of AAUP and also to make the type of investment that would provide some additional class space in order to increase the student body. Professor Kirsch asked whether the deans would be given an opportunity to participate in the budget process or would they again just be given numbers that they would have to live with. Mr Shoup replied that the five-year plans, starting with FY 1989, were due in from the deans shortly, and that that was the vehicle established for the deans to make their suggestions about programs for the next five-year contracts, together with their statements of priorities. Dean Liebowitz said that the deans were invited to review their own plans for their respective schools, but not the totality of the budget; therefore, they had no means by which to weigh the priorities, i.e., whether funds should be used for academic programs or for real estate investments. Further discussion followed by Professors Levy, Fox, Garris, Grub, Schiff, Deering, Reeves, and Mr. Shoup.

Professor Kirsch then moved that the Faculty Senate invite the senior members of the administration, i.e., the President, the Provost, the Vice President for Academic Affairs, the Vice President and Treasurer, the Vice President for Administration and Research, and the Director of the Budget to attend the next meeting of the Senate in order to continue these deliberations. The motion was seconded. The question was called and the motion was adopted unanimously.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON COORDINATED PLANNING

No report was given because of the absence of a faculty representative.

GENERAL BUSINESS

On behalf of the Executive Committee, Professor Robinson moved the nomination of Professor Robert F. Dyer for election to the Committee on Appointment, Salary and Promotion Policies. The nomination was approved.

REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

On behalf of the Executive Committee, Professor Robinson reported that the Committee had been receiving responses and recommendations from Senate Standing Committees on the Mission and Directions Statements. These responses would be put together in a joint statement by the Executive Committee and a response from the Senate as a whole would be forthcoming. In the matter of the nonconcurrence, she said that the Board of Trustees had sustained the nonconcurrence and that the faculty member involved would receive tenure. The next meeting of the Executive Committee was November 20th, and any resolutions for

the December Senate meeting ought to be received by the Committee by that date.

Professor Robinson said that she thought the Senate had accomplished a great deal in this session thus far which she attributed to the incredible amount of work and cooperation from members of the Senate and Senate Standing Committees. She thanked them on behalf of the Executive Committee and herself personally for their splendid efforts.

Professor Tolchin, speaking as a member of the Executive Committee, complimented Professor Robinson on her fine leadership and on the support of the staff in the Faculty Senate Office.

BRIEF STATEMENTS

Professors Fox, Tolchin, and Robinson submitted copies of resolutions adopted by the faculties of their respective schools regarding the operating budget problem for attachment to the minutes. (Resolutions adopted by SEAS, SGBA, and CCAS are attached and made a part of these minutes.)

Professor Smith said that the Committee on the Judicial System would be submitting a resolution for Senate action at its December or January meeting on the proposed new Code of Student Conduct.

ADJOURNMENT

Upon a motion being made and seconded, the meeting was adjourned by Professor Robinson at 4:05 p.m.



J. Matthew Gaglione
Registrar

A RESOLUTION RELATING TO SABBATICAL LEAVE POLICY (87/3)

WHEREAS, the purposes of granting sabbatical leave are adequately set forth in Article VI. of the Faculty Code; and

WHEREAS, the appropriate circumstances of granting sabbatical leave are various and elude consensus and specification; and

WHEREAS, the processes of decision with respect to sabbatical leave approval inevitably involve the exercise of discretions; NOW, THEREFORE

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY:

- (1) That the Faculty Senate recommends that no new language be added to the Faculty Handbook or Faculty Code which would attempt further specification of the circumstances under which sabbatical leave will be granted or denied; and
- (2) That the Faculty Senate urges that the possibility of a faculty member's receiving remuneration in addition to his or her University salary should not be deemed relevant to granting or denying a sabbatical leave, unless the requirements of obtaining such additional compensation interfere unduly with the purposes of granting the sabbatical leave.

Committee on Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom
October 22, 1987

Adopted November 13, 1987

A Resolution by the Faculty
of the School of Engineering and Applied Science
to Dr. Lloyd Hartman Elliott, President
The George Washington University

WHEREAS, the faculty of the School of Engineering and Applied Science is deeply concerned and distressed on being informed that the School's operating budget for 1987-88 must be reduced by two percent to help overcome a shortage in expected revenue from an activity of the University which is not part of its academic programs; and

WHEREAS, the endowment ought to support the academic programs of the University; and

WHEREAS, the proposed reduction is expected to effect all budgets for the ensuing years; and

WHEREAS, the School has been on record with the University Administration in reporting annually that there are serious structural deficiencies in our operating budgets; and

WHEREAS, these deficiencies have not been addressed in light of the continuing need to provide the School's undergraduate students with an accredited high quality engineering education; and

WHEREAS, this proposed budget reduction will surely weaken the operation of the School's programs of instruction and further impedes its ability to contribute to the excellence required by a world-class institution of higher learning, as espoused in the Commission for the Year 2000 Report; and

WHEREAS, proposed reductions, brought about by deficiencies in budget planning, create great difficulty in undertaking the planning called for in the Commission for the Year 2000 Report.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED: that you give recognition to what the faculty of the School of Engineering and Applied Science perceives to be the damaging consequences of this action to the academic programs of this School and the University, and that you fulfill your academic leadership responsibilities as President of the University in seeking and implementing alternatives to the proposed action.

Adopted by the Faculty of the School of Engineering and Applied Science, November 5, 1987.

A Resolution by the Faculty
of the School of Government and Business Administration
to Dr. Lloyd Hartman Elliott, President
The George Washington University

WHEREAS, the faculty of the School of Government and Business Administration is concerned and frustrated on being informed that the School's operating budget for 1987-88 must be reduced by two percent to overcome a shortage in expected revenue from business activities of the University which are not part of its academic programs; and

WHEREAS, alternative sources should be found to support the academic programs of the University; and

WHEREAS, the proposed reduction is expected to effect budgets for years 1987-88, 1988-89, and 1989-90; and

WHEREAS, SGBA is on record with the University Administration in budget hearings that there are serious structural deficiencies in our operating budgets; and

WHEREAS, these deficiencies have not been addressed in light of the continuing needs for the development of SGBA; and

WHEREAS, this proposed budget reduction will diminish the reputation and operation of the School's programs and further impede its ability to achieve high academic quality as SGBA moves to the 21st Century; and

WHEREAS, proposed reductions, brought about by deficiencies in budget planning and contingency planning for the business activities as well as academic programs.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED: that you give recognition to the concerns of the faculty of the School of Government and Business Administration for the damaging consequences of this action on the academic programs of this School and the University, and that your academic leadership responsibilities as President of the University be influential in seeking and implementing alternatives to the proposed budget action.

Adopted unanimously by the Faculty of the School of Government and Business Administration, November 6, 1987.

✓ / Lewis B. Newell
Gary Oren
James B. Thurman
Levi W. Park
Worthy F. Boggs
William G. Wells
Charles Shepherd
Guin Gardner
James J. McElroy
Frank W. Biegel
W. C. Morris
Stephen J. Fahey
F. Roberts
G. Scott
Richard Sonnen
Kent Kerr

Robert H. Glendower
W. M. Reever
O. L. Lipel
Philip W. Witz
Jay B. Horne
Jr. J. Tolson
John F. Lobutis, Jr.
Freddie D. Goss
Robert J. Dyer
Theodore M. Barnhill
Joe W. Kast
Edmund Smith
William W. Hardgrave
J. J. P. T.
Deborah Smith Cook
Tom McCa
Frederick Newcomer
Jameson Klee

Virginia McElroy
Dorothy McElroy
Stephen P. McElroy
C. B. McElroy
Inez McElroy
Theo McElroy
Paul McElroy
H. McElroy
D. F. McElroy
~~McElroy~~
Willie C. McElroy
Sarah B. McElroy
~~Hannah McElroy~~
Mark McElroy
~~McElroy~~

Lucille McElroy
Bryn McElroy
~~Pat McElroy~~
Ernest McElroy
John McElroy
Joseph H. McElroy
~~McElroy~~
William McElroy
Hilbert McElroy
F. C. McElroy
Garrison
Doris McElroy
Richard G. McElroy
J. McElroy
Suzanne N. McElroy
Michael McElroy
~~McElroy~~

October 23, 1987

A RESOLUTION BY THE FACULTY OF COLUMBIAN COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES TO PRESIDENT LLOYD H. ELLIOTT, THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY:

WHEREAS the faculty of Columbian College of Arts and Sciences is deeply distressed to learn that the University administration expects the College to reduce its already allocated budget for 1987-88 by two percent due to a shortfall in expected revenues; and

WHEREAS this or similar reduction will apparently also be applied to academic base budgets for the Academic Year 1988-89; and

WHEREAS this dismaying picture of University financial misplanning is unfolded to the academic departments at a time when we are being asked to prepare and present for the first time our five-year plans under a procedure called for in the YEAR 2000 Report, at a time when the University is within our community and to the world at large presenting itself as verging upon a breakthrough into becoming a world-class research institution of higher learning, and at a time when we are engaged in a \$75 million capital campaign publicized as being devoted to academic upgrading; and

WHEREAS any of the possibilities presented us so far for meeting this crisis is bound to have severe deleterious effects upon academic programs underway for this year and especially so upon programs being planned under budgeting procedures for next year; and

WHEREAS this matter is being presented as a fact to academic personnel who traditionally have not received information about how the University is capitalized and how overall financial and economic planning and operations are carried out;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the faculty of Columbian College of Arts and Sciences asks you to recognize fully the tremendously damaging and potentially damaging effects of this matter and to discharge fully your responsibilities as chief operating and administrative officer of the University under the Board of Trustees by moving to meet this crisis through seeking and finding alternatives other than asking academic units to bear the brunt of the anticipated short amounts; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that you as President concurrently direct a full examination and correction of the system of financial management of the University, especially in the matter of contingency planning, to try to ensure against any similar financial crisis in the future.

Adopted unanimously by voice vote at the Special CCAS Faculty Meeting, October 23, 1987.

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY
Washington, D. C.

The Faculty Senate

October 30, 1987

The Faculty Senate will meet on Friday, November 13, 1987, at 2:10 p.m., in Lisner Hall 603.

AGENDA

1. Call to order
2. Approval of the minutes of the regular meeting of October 9, 1987
3. Resolutions:
A RESOLUTION RELATING TO SABBATICAL LEAVE POLICY (87/3); Professor John A. Morgan, Jr., Chairman, Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom Committee (Resolution 87/3 is attached.)
4. Introduction of Resolutions
5. Report by Robert D. Shoup, Director of the Budget, on Enrollment Figures for Fall 1987 and Budgetary Planning for 1988-89 (Report attached.)
6. Report by a faculty representative from the Committee on Coordinated Planning
7. General Business:
 - (a) Nomination for election of Professor Robert F. Dyer to the Committee on Appointment, Salary and Promotion Policies
 - (b) Report of the Executive Committee: Professor Lilien F. Robinson, Chairman
8. Brief Statements
9. Adjournment



J. Matthew Gaglione
Secretary

A RESOLUTION RELATING TO SABBATICAL LEAVE POLICY (87/3)

WHEREAS, the purposes of granting sabbatical leave are adequately set forth in Article VI. of the Faculty Code; and

WHEREAS, the appropriate circumstances of granting sabbatical leave are various and elude consensus and specification; and

WHEREAS, the processes of decision with respect to sabbatical leave approval inevitably involve the exercise of discretions; NOW, THEREFORE

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY:

- (1) That the Faculty Senate recommends that no new language be added to the Faculty Handbook or Faculty Code which would attempt further specification of the circumstances under which sabbatical leave will be granted or denied; and
- (2) That the Faculty Senate urges that the possibility of a faculty member's receiving remuneration in addition to his or her University salary should not be deemed relevant to granting or denying a sabbatical leave, unless the requirements of obtaining such additional compensation interfere unduly with the purposes of granting the sabbatical leave.

Committee on Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom
October 22, 1987

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY
INTERDEPARTMENTAL MEMORANDUM

October 30, 1987

Memorandum to Professor Lilien F. Robinson, Chair
Executive Committee, Faculty Senate

Attached are the materials that were prepared for the Budget Committee to review the guidelines and proposed tuition rates for fiscal 1988-89. Unlike in prior years an actual budget has not been developed at this time. The proposed new year budget will be submitted to the Board of Trustees in March 1988 to coordinate with the implementation of our new planning process. The following usual materials are available:

- A. Three pages of Enrollment Summaries,
- B. A statement of Proposed Expense and Revenue Changes from fiscal 1987-88 into fiscal 1988-89,
- C. A page of proposed tuition rates for 1988-89,
- D. Three schedules of comparative tuition rates.



Robert D. Shoup
Director of the Budget

Attachment

Enrollment - Fall 1987
 (Excluding the Medical Center)
 Comparisons to Fall 1986 & Projected Fall 1987

	<u>Actual Fall 1987</u>	<u>Actual Fall 1987</u>
	<u>Over (Under)</u>	<u>Over (Under)</u>
	<u>Actual Fall 1986</u>	<u>Projected Fall 1987</u>
Undergraduate Students		
Full-time		
Columbian College	51	191
Education & Human Development	--	(1)
Engineering & Applied Science	(62)	(58)
Government & Business Administration	132	159
International Affairs	55	23
Subtotal	<u>176</u>	<u>314</u>
Part-time		
Columbian College	(14)	(26)
Education & Human Development	(17)	(23)
Engineering & Applied Science	(8)	(8)
Government & Business Administration	15	6
International Affairs	(7)	(1)
Subtotal	<u>(31)</u>	<u>(52)</u>
Graduate Students		
Arts & Sciences	(19)	(5)
Education & Human Development	(30)	(24)
Engineering & Applied Science	3	(2)
Government & Business Administration	(213)	(182)
International Affairs	(18)	(12)
Subtotal	<u>(277)</u>	<u>(225)</u>
Law Students	(85)	(75)
Non-Degree Students	<u>(92)</u>	<u>(66)</u>
Total	<u>(309)</u>	<u>(104)</u>

Enrollment Data**
(Excluding Continuous Enrollment)
Fall Semesters 1983 - 1988

		ACTUAL					PROJECTIONS	
		1983	1984	1985	1986	1987	1987	1988
Columbian College								
Undergraduate	Full-time	2,400	2,505	2,658	2,674	2,725	2,534	2,670
	Part-time	421	377	338	311	297	323	310
	Total	2,821	2,882	2,996	2,985	3,022	2,857	2,980
Graduate Arts & Sciences								
Masters		596	651	586	526	506	530	510
PHD's		385	374	355	368	369	350	370
	Total	981	1,025	941	894	875	880	880
Education & Human Development								
Undergraduate	Full-time	131	123	115	139	139	140	140
	Part-time	49	43	55	44	27	50	30
Graduate		801	787	813	756	726	750	730
	Total	981	953	983	939	892	940	900
Engineering & Applied Science								
Undergraduate	Full-time	729	751	720	684	622	680	600
	Part-time	209	185	159	130	122	130	130
Graduate		1,515	1,590	1,594	1,595	1,598	1,600	1,600
	Total	2,453	2,526	2,473	2,409	2,342	2,410	2,330
Government & Business Admin.								
Undergraduate	Full-time	996	1,081	1,118	1,177	1,309	1,150	1,230
	Part-time	180	148	138	141	156	150	160
Graduate-Masters		2,178	2,088	2,006	2,112	1,915	2,100	1,920
Doctoral		103	91	111	119	103	100	100
	Total	3,457	3,408	3,373	3,549	3,483	3,500	3,410
National Law Center								
Juris Doctor	Full-time	1,002	1,031	1,096	1,116	1,109	1,100	1,110
	Part-time	427	392	349	316	278	320	270
Post JD		266	281	284	278	238	280	240
	Total	1,695	1,704	1,729	1,710	1,625	1,700	1,620
International Affairs								
Undergraduate	Full-time	467	540	596	664	719	696	720
	Part-time	44	64	63	43	36	37	40
Graduate		352	427	453	406	388	400	390
	Total	863	1,031	1,112	1,113	1,143	1,133	1,150
Div. of University Students		1,925	1,901	1,646	1,458	1,383	1,440	1,300
English Language Institute		57	47	83	78	61	70	70

	ACTUAL					PROJECTIONS	
	1983	1984	1985	1986	1987	1987	1988
SUBTOTALS							
Undergraduate	Full-time	4,723	5,000	5,207	5,338	5,514	5,200
	Part-time	903	817	753	669	638	690
Graduate		5,930	6,008	5,918	5,882	5,605	5,830
Juris Doctor	Full-time	1,002	1,031	1,096	1,116	1,109	1,100
	Part-time	427	392	349	316	278	320
Post JD		266	281	284	278	238	280
Non-Degree		1,982	1,948	1,729	1,536	1,444	1,510
TOTAL - GENERAL UNIVERSITY		15,233	15,477	15,336	15,135	14,826	14,930
Medicine & Health Sciences							
Allied Health		147	150	138	90	127	100
Doctor of Medicine		620	605	615	600	609	600
Total		767	755	753	690	736	700
GRAND TOTAL		16,000	16,232	16,089	15,825	15,562	15,630
		16,000	16,232	16,089	15,825	15,562	15,370

**NOTE: This is a Budget Office report for planning purposes only.

1988-89 Operating Budget
Proposed Expense and Revenue Changes
(Excluding Auxiliary Enterprises and the Medical Center)

EXPENSES**Program Requirements**

Retirement Plan	\$ 900,000
Asst. Prof. Salary Adj.	125,000
Secretariat Salary Adj.	400,000
Medical Benefits (@\$20)	<u>450,000</u>
	<u>\$1,875,000</u>

Incremental Increases

Salary/Wage/Fringe Benefits	6.0%	4,923,000
Expenses and Equipment	5.0%	1,193,000
Graduate Stipends	15.0%	138,000
Student Aid - Tuition	8.5% (6.6% Law)	<u>927,000</u>
		<u>7,181,000</u>
		<u>9,056,000</u>

Expense Reductions

Capital Projects	(350,000)
One-time 1987-88 Items	<u>(356,000)</u>
	<u>(706,000)</u>
Net Expense Increases	<u>8,350,000</u>

REVENUES

Non-Tuition Sources	250,000
On-Campus Tuition	\$7,500,000
Off-Campus Tuition	<u>600,000</u>
	<u>8,100,000</u>
Net Revenue Increases	<u>8,350,000</u>

PROPOSED TUITION RATES 1988-89

	<u>Current</u>	<u>Proposed</u>	<u>Percent Increase</u>
Columbian College, GSAS, SEHD, SGBA, SIA, DUS			
Full-time	\$ 8,820	\$ 9,570	8.5
Part-time and Graduate	330	358	8.5
Engineering and Applied Science			
Full-time	9,684	10,508	8.5
Part-time and Graduate	360	391	8.5
Law			
JD Full-time	11,300	12,050	6.6
Part-time	404	431	6.6
Post JD	307	327	6.6
SJD (For the Program)	10,390	11,075	6.6
SGBA Doctoral (For the Program)	22,410	24,315	8.5
Summer			
Regular	268	291	8.5
SEAS	318	345	8.5
Off-Campus			
General	222	241	8.5
Crystal City	222	260	17.1

COMPARATIVE TUITION RATES

Approved
1987-88

Proposed
1988-89

Undergraduates

Cornell University	\$12,300	
Columbia University	11,812	
Boston University	11,800	
Northwestern University	11,637	
Washington University (St. Louis)	11,400	
University of Southern California	11,302	
University of Rochester	11,160	
New York University	11,130	
Carnegie-Mellon Institute	11,100	
University of Pennsylvania	10,968	
Georgetown University	10,940	
Tulane University	10,500	
Vanderbilt University	10,300	
Duke University	10,000	
Case Western Reserve University	10,000	
American University	9,644	
University of Miami	9,624	
 The George Washington University	 <u>8,820</u>	 <u>\$9,570</u> (8.5% incr.)
Syracuse University	8,710	
Catholic University	8,540	
Trinity College	7,938	
Fordham University	7,660	
Temple University	6,172	
University of Maryland (non-resident)	4,846	
George Mason University (non-resident)	3,648	

COMPARATIVE TUITION RATES

	<u>Approved</u> <u>1987-88</u>	<u>Proposed</u> <u>1988-89</u>
--	-----------------------------------	-----------------------------------

Engineering

Cornell University	\$12,300	
Columbia University	11,812	
Boston University	11,800	
Northwestern University	11,637	
Washington University (St. Louis)	11,400	
University of Southern California	11,302	
University of Rochester	11,160	
New York University	11,130	
Carnegie-Mellon Institute	11,100	
University of Pennsylvania	10,968	
Tulane University	10,500	
Vanderbilt University	10,300	
Duke University	10,034	
Case Western Reserve University	10,000	
 The George Washington University	 <u>9,684</u>	 <u>\$10,508 (8.5% incr.)</u>
University of Miami	9,624	
Syracuse University	8,710	
Catholic University	8,640	
Temple University	6,172	
University of Maryland (non-resident)	4,846	

COMPARATIVE TUITION RATES

Approved
1987-88

Proposed
1988-89

Law

New York University	\$13,200	
Columbia University	13,100	
Cornell University	12,750	
University of Pennsylvania	12,300	
Vanderbilt University	11,900	
Boston University	11,800	
Northwestern University	11,637	
Georgetown University	11,500	
 The George Washington University	 <u>11,300</u>	 <u>\$12,050</u> (6.6% incr.)
 Washington University (St. Louis)	 10,900	
Catholic University	10,640	
American University	10,540	
Case Western Reserve University	10,500	
Fordham University	10,350	
Syracuse University	10,260	
Temple University	8,640	